



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/040,781	12/28/2001	David Wei-Gwo Wang	9767-0108-999	2123

24341 7590 12/13/2006

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP.
2 PALO ALTO SQUARE
3000 EL CAMINO REAL
PALO ALTO, CA 94306

EXAMINER

ESCALANTE, OVIDIO

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2614

DATE MAILED: 12/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/040,781

Applicant(s)

WANG ET AL.

Examiner

Ovidio Escalante

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 September 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 12, 14-20, 22, 23, 25, 27-33, 35, 36, 38 and 40-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 41 and 42 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7-10, 12, 14-20, 22-23, 25, 27-33, 35-36, 38 and 40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to applicant's response filed on September 19, 2006. **Claims 1-10,12,14-20,22,23,25,27-33,35,36,38,40-42** are now pending in the present application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2614

5. Claims 7-10,12,14-20,22-23,25,27-33,35-36,38 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Langsenkamp US Patent 5,912,947 in view of Hiltunen et al. US Patent 6,754,484 and further in view of Zirngibl et al. US Patent 6,798,867.

Regarding claim 7, Langsenkamp, teaches a method of voice organizer message delivery, (abstract; col. 5, lines 52-63) comprising:

recording a voice organizer message from a first user, (col. 7, lines 53-57);

associating message-specific passcode with the voice organizer message, (col. 18, lines 37-45);

storing the voice organizer message to be delivered to a second user on a specified date, (col. 9, lines 52-67; col. 12, lines 60-66; col. 18, lines 20-24);

upon said specified date, delivering the voice organizer message to the second user, (col. 12, lines 60-66; col. 14, lines 36-43).

While Langsenkamp teaches of specifying a passcode, Langsenkamp does not specifically teach wherein the passcode is specified by the first user.

In the same field of endeavor, Hiltunen teaches that it was well known in the art to provide a system in which a message sender will specify a passcode for a message, (col. 4, lines 45-56; col. 5, lines 51-col. 6, line 5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Langsenkamp by allowing the message sender to specify the passcode as taught by Hiltunen so that only authorized recipients can listen to the message.

While Langsenkamp and Hiltunen teach of periodically delivering the message, Langsenkamp does not specifically teach of periodically redelivering the message at a frequency

Art Unit: 2614

specified by the first user wherein the frequency is selected from a group consisting of at least three frequencies.

In the same field of endeavor, Zirngibl teaches periodically redelivering a voice organizer message at a frequency specified by a first user, wherein the frequency is selected from a group consisting of at least three frequencies, (col. 10, lines 23-39; col. 19, lines 3-10,16-31).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Langsenkamp by selecting from a group of frequencies as taught by Zirngibl so taught a more flexible message delivery time can be selected based on each users needs.

Regarding claims 16 and 29, Langsenkamp, as applied to claims 1,15 and 28, does not specifically teach wherein the first and second users are the same user.

In the same field of endeavor, Zirngibl teaches wherein the second user and the first user are the same user, (col. 10, lines 9-21).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Langsenkamp by allowing the second user to be the first user as taught by Zirngibl so that the user can send information to themselves such as if they want to be reminded of certain events or to receive periodic reports about certain events.

Regarding claims 17 and 30, Langsenkamp in view of Zirngibl, as applied to claims 1,15 and 28, teaches wherein the at least three frequencies include daily, weekly and monthly, (col. 10, lines 23-39).

As stated above, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Langsenkamp by selecting from a group of frequencies as

Art Unit: 2614

taught by Zirngibl so taught a more flexible message delivery time can be selected based on each users needs.

Regarding claim 8, Langsenkamp, as applied to claim 7, teaches wherein the delivering step includes:

notifying the second user of the voice organizer message, (col. 19, lines 41-55; col. 19, lines 50-65);

upon a response from the second user, playing the voice organizer message, (col. 19, lines 50-65).

Regarding claim 9, Langsenkamp, as applied to claim 8, teaches wherein the response from the second user includes entering the message-specific passcode, (col. 18 lines 37-45; col. 21, lines 61-67).

Regarding claim 10, Langsenkamp, as applied to claim 7, teaches including responding to commands from the first user by modifying the message-specific passcode associated with the voice organizer message, (col. 18 lines 37-45; col. 21, lines 61-67).

Regarding claim 12, Langsenkamp teaches a method of voice organizer message delivery (abstract) comprising:

recording a voice organizer message from a first user, (col. 7, lines 53-57);

associating message-specific passcode with the voice organizer message, (col. 18, lines 37-45; col. 21, lines 61-67);

storing the voice organizer message to be delivered to a second user on a specified date; (col. 9, lines 52-67; col. 12, lines 60-66; col. 18, lines 20-24);

Art Unit: 2614

upon said specified date, automatically calling the second user to deliver the voice organizer message to the second user, (col. 12, lines 60-66; col. 14, lines 36-43).

While Langsenkamp teaches of specifying a passcode, Langsenkamp does not specifically teach wherein the passcode is specified by the first user.

In the same field of endeavor, Hiltunen teaches that it was well known in the art to provide a system in which a message sender will specify a passcode for a message, (col. 4, lines 45-56; col. 5, lines 51-col. 6, line 5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Langsenkamp by allowing the message sender to specify the passcode as taught by Hiltunen so that only authorized recipients can listen to the message.

Langsenkamp and Hiltunen do not specifically teach if delivery of the voice organizer message fails, placing the voice organizer message in a voice mailbox associated with the second user.

In the same field of endeavor, Zirngibl teaches if delivery of the voice organizer message fails, placing the voice organizer message in a voice mailbox associated with the second user, (col. 21, lines 28-41).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Langsenkamp by placing the message in the voicemail box of the user as taught by Zirngibl so that the user can still be able to receive the messages if the correct user was not available to receive the message.

Art Unit: 2614

Regarding claim 14, Langsenkamp, as applied to claim 12, teaches wherein delivery of the voice organizer message fails when the second user fails to enter the message-specific passcode, (col. 18, lines 37-45; col. 21, lines 61-67).

Regarding claims 15 and 28, Langsenkamp teaches a voice organizer system and a computer program product for use in conjunction with a computer system, the computer program product comprising a computer readable storage medium and a computer program mechanism embedded therein (abstract; fig. 1) comprising:

a central processing unit, (fig. 1);

a message intake module, executed by the central processing unit, for recording and storing a voice organizer message created by a first user, (col. 7, lines 53-57; col. 9, lines 52-67) and for associating message-specific passcode with the voice organizer message, (col. 18, lines 37-45; col. 21, lines 61-67);

a message delivery module, executed by the central processing unit, (col. 12, lines 60-66; col. 14, lines 36-43), the message delivery module including instructions for:

delivering the voice organizer message to a second user on a date specified by the first user, (col. 12, lines 60-66; col. 14, lines 36-43).

While Langsenkamp teaches of specifying a passcode, Langsenkamp does not specifically teach wherein the passcode is specified by the first user.

In the same field of endeavor, Hiltunen teaches that it was well known in the art to provide a system in which a message sender will specify a passcode for a message, (col. 4, lines 45-56; col. 5, lines 51-col. 6, line 5).

Art Unit: 2614

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Langsenkamp by allowing the message sender to specify the passcode as taught by Hiltunen so that only authorized recipients can listen to the message.

While Langsenkamp and Hiltunen teach of periodically delivering the message, Langsenkamp does not specifically teach of periodically redelivering the message at a frequency specified by the first user wherein the frequency is selected from a group consisting of at least three frequencies.

In the same field of endeavor, Zirngibl teaches periodically redelivering a voice organizer message at a frequency specified by a first user, wherein the frequency is selected from a group consisting of at least three frequencies, (col. 10, lines 23-39; col. 19, lines 3-10,16-31).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Langsenkamp by selecting from a group of frequencies as taught by Zirngibl so taught a more flexible message delivery time can be selected based on each users needs.

Regarding claims 18 and 31, Langsenkamp, as applied to claims 15 and 28, teaches the message modification module further including modification instructions for responding to commands from the first user to modify the voice organizer message, (col. 9, lines 1-17; col. 10, lines 15-32).

Regarding claims 19 and 32, Langsenkamp, as applied to claims 18 and 31, the message intake module further including modification instructions for responding to commands from the first user to change the specified date of the voice organizer message, (col. 9, lines 1-17; col. 10, lines 15-32).

Regarding claims 20 and 33, Langsenkamp, as applied to claims 18 and 31, teaches the message intake module further including modification instructions for responding to commands from the first user to change the frequency of the voice organizer message, (col. 12, lines 60-66).

Regarding claims 22 and 35, Langsenkamp, as applied to claims 18 and 31, teaches the message intake module further including modification instructions for responding to commands from the first user to modify the message-specific passcode associated with the voice organizer message, (col. 18, lines 37-45; col. 21, lines 61-67).

Regarding claim 23 and 36, Langsenkamp, as applied to claims 15 and 28, teaches wherein the message delivery module includes instructions requiring entry of the message-specific passcode by the second user in order to deliver the voice organizer message to the second user. (col. 18, lines 37-45; col. 21, lines 61-67).

Regarding claims 25 and 38, Langsenkamp teaches a voice organizer system and a computer program product for use in conjunction with a computer system, the computer program product comprising a computer readable storage medium and a computer program mechanism embedded therein (abstract) comprising:

a central processing unit, (fig. 1);

a message intake module, executed by the central processing unit, for recording and storing a voice organizer message created by a first user, (col. 7, lines 53-57; col. 9, lines 52-67) and for associating message-specific passcode with the voice organizer message, (col. 18, lines 37-45; col. 21, lines 61-67);

a message delivery module, executed by the central processing unit, the message delivery module (col. 12, lines 60-66; col. 14, lines 36-43) including instructions for:

Art Unit: 2614

automatically calling the second user on a date specified by the first user to deliver the voice organizer message to the second user, (col. 12, lines 60-66; col. 14, lines 36-43; col. 21, lines 38-60).

While Langsenkamp teaches of specifying a passcode, Langsenkamp does not specifically teach wherein the passcode is specified by the first user.

In the same field of endeavor, Hiltunen teaches that it was well known in the art to provide a system in which a message sender will specify a passcode for a message, (col. 4, lines 45-56; col. 5, lines 51-col. 6, line 5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Langsenkamp by allowing the message sender to specify the passcode as taught by Hiltunen so that only authorized recipients can listen to the message.

While Langsenkamp and Hiltunen teach if delivery of the voice organizer message fails, placing the voice organizer message in a voice mailbox associated with the second user.

In the same field of endeavor, Zirngibl teaches if delivery of the voice organizer message fails, placing the voice organizer message in a voice mailbox associated with the second user, (col. 21, lines 28-41).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Langsenkamp by placing the message in the voicemail box of the user as taught by Zirngibl so that the user can still be able to receive the messages if the correct user was not available to receive the message.

Regarding claims 27 and 40, Langsenkamp, as applied to claims 25 and 38, teaches wherein the message delivery module includes instructions causing delivery of the voice

Art Unit: 2614

organizer message to fail if the second user fails to enter the message-specific passcode, (col. 18, lines 37-45; col. 21, lines 61-67).

6. Claims 7,12,15,25,28 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiltunen et al. US Patent 6,754,484 in view of Zirngibl et al. US Patent 6,798,867.

Regarding claims 7 and 12, Hiltunen, teaches a method of voice organizer message delivery, (abstract; col. 4, lines 45-56) comprising:

recording a voice organizer message from a first user, (col. 4, lines 45-56);

associating message-specific passcode with the voice organizer message, wherein the passcode is specified by the first user (abstract; col. 5, lines 51-col. 6, line 5,29-37);

storing the voice organizer message to be delivered to a second user on a specified date, (col. 5, lines 12-28);

upon said specified date, delivering the voice organizer message to the second user, (col. 6, lines 29-42).

While Hiltunen teaches of periodically delivering the message, Hiltunen does not specifically teach of periodically redelivering the message at a frequency specified by the first user wherein the frequency is selected from a group consisting of at least three frequencies.

In the same field of endeavor, Zirngibl teaches periodically redelivering a voice organizer message at a frequency specified by a first user, wherein the frequency is selected from a group consisting of at least three frequencies, (col. 10, lines 23-39; col. 19, lines 3-10,16-31).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hiltunen by selecting from a group of frequencies as taught by

Art Unit: 2614

Zirngibl so taught a more flexible message delivery time can be selected based on each users needs.

Regarding claims 15,25,28 and 38, Hiltunen teaches a voice organizer system and a computer program product for use in conjunction with a computer system, the computer program product comprising a computer readable storage medium and a computer program mechanism embedded therein (abstract) comprising:

a central processing unit, (fig. 4);

a message intake module, executed by the central processing unit, for recording and storing a voice organizer message created by a first user, (col. 5, lines 45-56) and for associating message-specific passcode with the voice organizer message, wherein the passcode is specified by the first user (col. 5, line 51-col. 6, line 5,29-37);

a message delivery module, executed by the central processing unit, (col. 5, lines 12-28), the message delivery module including instructions for:

delivering the voice organizer message to a second user on a date specified by the first user, (col. 6, lines 29-42).

While Hiltunen teaches of periodically delivering the message, Hiltunen does not specifically teach of periodically redelivering the message at a frequency specified by the first user wherein the frequency is selected from a group consisting of at least three frequencies.

In the same field of endeavor, Zirngibl teaches periodically redelivering a voice organizer message at a frequency specified by a first user, wherein the frequency is selected from a group consisting of at least three frequencies, (col. 10, lines 23-39; col. 19, lines 3-10,16-31).

Art Unit: 2614

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hiltunen by selecting from a group of frequencies as taught by Zirngibl so taught a more flexible message delivery time can be selected based on each users needs.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed September 19, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant contends that Hiltunen does not teach of the limitation of a message-specific passcode specified by the first user, since the password in Hiltunen is specified by the recipient, not the sender, and is not message specific but instead is recipient specific. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

In the cited paragraphs as shown in the Office Action, Hiltunen teaches one of the various alternatives to PGP encryption is assigning each user address (e.g. e-mail address) with a corresponding password that will be used to access a message stored by a sender. In such a system, the sender will use the recipient's e-mail address to transmit the message to a desired beacon for storage and the recipient will gain access to the message by entering the recipient's password.

Hiltunen teaches that the e-mail address as an associated password and that a sender will supply the e-mail address with the specific message that is intended for a specific recipient. Since the sender submits a specific e-mail address for a specific message then the passcode is specified by the first user i.e. is specified by the message sender, by having the message sender enter the e-mail address which has an associated password. Since the private message is only for a specific

Art Unit: 2614

recipient and since the sender enters a specific e-mail address then the passcode/e-mail address is message specific since it is only usable for that message at that specific time.

Applicant contends that Zirngibl does not teaches periodically redelivering a voice message at a frequency specified by the first user wherein the frequency is selected from a group consisting of at least three frequencies, since Zirngibl only uses a scheduling condition for voice services and not a voice organizer message. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

While Zirngibl states that the scheduling is for a voice service, the Examiner notes that the voice service of Zirngibl as shown throughout the Patent is based on delivering voice messages. Therefore, the scheduling is based on a voice message.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 1-6 and 41-42 are allowed.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2614

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(571) 273-7537, (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ovidio Escalante whose telephone number is 571-272-7537. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 6:30AM to 3:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan S Tsang can be reached on 571-272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Art Unit: 2614

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

OVIDIO ESCALANTE
PATENT EXAMINER
Ovidio Escalante

Ovidio Escalante
Primary Patent Examiner
Group 2614
December 1, 2006

O.E./oe